

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

ANGEL L. RUIZ,

Plaintiff,

-against-

NEW YORK CITY POLICE DEPARTMENT,  
43RD PRECINCT,

Defendant.

23-CV-7386 (LTS)

ORDER OF DISMISSAL WITH LEAVE TO  
REPLEAD

LAURA TAYLOR SWAIN, Chief United States District Judge:

Plaintiff, who is appearing *pro se*, brings this action under the court’s diversity jurisdiction, alleging that the police failed to investigate his claim about being the victim of a hate crime in 2021. By order dated August 30, 2023, the Court granted Plaintiff’s request to proceed *in forma pauperis* (“IFP”), that is, without prepayment of fees. The Court dismisses the action for the reasons set forth below.

**STANDARD OF REVIEW**

The Court must dismiss an IFP complaint, or any portion of the complaint, that is frivolous or malicious, fails to state a claim on which relief may be granted, or seeks monetary relief from a defendant who is immune from such relief. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B); *see Livingston v. Adirondack Beverage Co.*, 141 F.3d 434, 437 (2d Cir. 1998). The Court must also dismiss a complaint when the Court lacks subject matter jurisdiction of the claims raised. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(h)(3).

While the law mandates dismissal on any of these grounds, the Court is obliged to construe *pro se* pleadings liberally, *Harris v. Mills*, 572 F.3d 66, 72 (2d Cir. 2009), and interpret them to raise the “strongest [claims] that they suggest,” *Triestman v. Fed. Bureau of Prisons*, 470 F.3d 471, 474 (2d Cir. 2006) (internal quotation marks and citations omitted) (emphasis in

original). But the “special solicitude” in *pro se* cases, *id.* at 475 (citation omitted), has its limits – to state a claim, *pro se* pleadings still must comply with Rule 8 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, which requires a complaint to make a short and plain statement showing that the pleader is entitled to relief.

### BACKGROUND

In this complaint, Plaintiff, a resident of Bronx County, names the following Defendants: (1) the New York Police Department, 43rd Precinct (“NYPD”); (2) “POM”<sup>1</sup> Rosa Anderson; (3) Sgt. Joseph Bermudez; POM Moustafa; and (4) Sgt. Warkenthien. The following facts are drawn from the complaint. On January 13, 2021, Plaintiff entered the CTown Supermarket located at 1580 Unionport Road in the Bronx. Plaintiff asked a cashier and the manager, Halmet A. Cuesta, if he could pay for a lightbulb with quarters. ECF 1 ¶ III.) Cuesta said, no, used a homophobic slur and said people like Plaintiff “need to be killed”; threatened to kill Plaintiff if he did not immediately leave the store; jumped on Plaintiff and tried to strangle him; and spit in Plaintiff’s face. (*Id.*)

Plaintiff called 911 to report the CTown incident. In response, police officers came to Plaintiff’s home, but “they never go with a hate crime to court.” (*Id.*) It appears that Plaintiff reported the incident two additional times, but the officers never investigated his claims or acted on them. (*Id.*) Plaintiff seeks \$10 million in damages.<sup>2</sup> (*Id.* ¶ IV.)

---

<sup>1</sup> Plaintiff does not explain what “POM” stands for.

<sup>2</sup> Plaintiff filed a separate complaint against CTown and Cuesta arising from the January 13, 2021, incident. *Ruiz v. HJ Fam. Corp.*, ECF 1:23-CV-7385, 1 (UA) (S.D.N.Y. filed Aug. 18, 2023). Plaintiff also recently filed four other *pro se* complaints. *See Ruiz v. Parkchester Pub. Safety Dep’t*, ECF 1:23-CV-7423, 1 (UA) (S.D.N.Y. filed Aug. 21, 2023); *Ruiz v. City of New York Comm’n on Hum. Rts.*, ECF 1:23-CV-7422, 1 (UA) (S.D.N.Y. filed Aug. 21, 2023); *Ruiz v. Fed. Police Dep’t*, ECF 1:23-CV-7421, 1 (UA) (S.D.N.Y. filed Aug. 18, 2023); *Ruiz v. U.S. Fed. Courthouse 40 Foley Square #104*, ECF 1:23-CV-7416, 1 (LTS) (S.D.N.Y. filed Aug. 18, 2023).

## DISCUSSION

### A. Subject matter jurisdiction

The subject matter jurisdiction of the federal district courts is limited and is set forth generally in 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1332. Under these statutes, federal jurisdiction is available only when a “federal question” is presented or when plaintiff and defendant are citizens of different states and the amount in controversy exceeds the sum or value of \$75,000. “[I]t is common ground that in our federal system of limited jurisdiction any party or the court *sua sponte*, at any stage of the proceedings, may raise the question of whether the court has subject matter jurisdiction.” *United Food & Com. Workers Union, Loc. 919, AFL-CIO v. CenterMark Prop. Meriden Square, Inc.*, 30 F.3d 298, 301 (2d Cir. 1994) (quoting *Manway Constr. Co., Inc. v. Hous. Auth. of the City of Hartford*, 711 F.2d 501, 503 (2d Cir. 1983)); *see* Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(h)(3) (“If the court determines at any time that it lacks subject-matter jurisdiction, the court must dismiss the action.”); *Ruhrgas AG v. Marathon Oil Co.*, 526 U.S. 574, 583 (1999) (“[S]ubject-matter delineations must be policed by the courts on their own initiative.”).

#### 1. Diversity jurisdiction

To establish jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1332, a plaintiff must first allege that the plaintiff and the defendant are citizens of different states. *Wis. Dep’t of Corr. v. Schacht*, 524 U.S. 381, 388 (1998). In addition, the plaintiff must allege to a “reasonable probability” that the claim is in excess of the sum or value of \$75,000.00, the statutory jurisdictional amount. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1332(a); *Colavito v. N.Y. Organ Donor Network, Inc.*, 438 F.3d 214, 221 (2d Cir. 2006) (citation and internal quotation marks omitted).

---

*See also Ruiz v. Keratin Bar*, ECF 1:17-CV-2216, 182 (VEC) (S.D.N.Y. Aug. 10, 2023) (dismissing complaint without prejudice for failure to prosecute).

Plaintiff invokes the Court's diversity jurisdiction, but he fails to allege facts demonstrating that the Court has diversity jurisdiction of this action. Plaintiff alleges that he is a citizen of New York State, and that Defendants are also residents of New York State. Even if the Court assumes that Plaintiff's claim exceeds the statutory amount in controversy, complete diversity of citizenship is lacking. The Court therefore lacks diversity jurisdiction of Plaintiff's claims.

## 2. Federal question jurisdiction

To invoke federal question jurisdiction, a plaintiff's claims must arise "under the Constitution, laws, or treaties of the United States." 28 U.S.C. § 1331. A case arises under federal law if the complaint "establishes either that federal law creates the cause of action or that the plaintiff's right to relief necessarily depends on resolution of a substantial question of federal law." *Bay Shore Union Free Sch. Dist. v. Kain*, 485 F.3d 730, 734-35 (2d Cir. 2007) (quoting *Empire Healthchoice Assur., Inc. v. McVeigh*, 547 U.S. 677, 690 (2006)). Mere invocation of federal jurisdiction, without any facts demonstrating a federal law claim, does not create federal subject matter jurisdiction. *See Nowak v. Ironworkers Loc. 6 Pension Fund*, 81 F.3d 1182, 1188-89 (2d Cir. 1996). Plaintiff does not invoke the Court's federal question jurisdiction, and he fails to allege any facts suggesting that he can assert a federal claim.

Insofar as Plaintiff sues the New York Police Department (NYPD) and NYPD officers, the Court construes the complaint as asserting claims under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. To state a claim under Section 1983, a plaintiff must allege both that: (1) a right secured by the Constitution or laws of the United States was violated, and (2) the right was violated by a person acting under the color of state law, or a "state actor." *West v. Atkins*, 487 U.S. 42, 48-49 (1988).

While the named defendants are state actors under Section 1983, Plaintiff fails to allege any facts suggesting that any of these defendants violated his federal rights. Plaintiff's sole

allegation with regards to either the City of New York or the NYPD officers is that they failed to investigate his claim about being the victim of a hate crime in 2021. To the extent Plaintiff is seeking to hold the City of New York or the NYPD officers liable for failing to investigate his complaints, he fails to state a claim because there is no right to either government assistance or to an investigation by government officials. *See Destany v. Winnebago Cnty. Dep't of Soc. Servs.*, 489 U.S. 189, 195-96 (1989) (the Due Process Clause generally confers no affirmative right to governmental aid); *Bernstein v. New York*, 591 F. Supp. 2d 448, 460 (S.D.N.Y. 2008) (holding that there is “no constitutional right to an investigation by government officials”) (citation omitted).<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> In addition, any Section 1983 claims that Plaintiff is asserting against the NYPD must be dismissed because an agency of the City of New York is not an entity that can be sued. N.Y. City Charter ch. 17, § 396 (“[A]ll actions and proceedings for the recovery of penalties for the violation of any law shall be brought in the name of the city of New York and not in that of any agency, except where otherwise provided by law.”); *Jenkins v. City of New York*, 478 F.3d 76, 93 n.19 (2d Cir. 2007); *see also Emerson v. City of New York*, 740 F. Supp. 2d 385, 396 (S.D.N.Y. 2010) (“[A] plaintiff is generally prohibited from suing a municipal agency.”). It may be Plaintiff’s intention to sue the City of New York. When a plaintiff sues a municipality under Section 1983, however, it is not enough for the plaintiff to allege that one of the municipality’s employees or agents engaged in some wrongdoing. The plaintiff must show that the municipality itself caused the violation of the plaintiff’s rights. *See Connick v. Thompson*, 563 U.S. 51, 60 (2011) (“A municipality or other local government may be liable under this section [1983] if the governmental body itself ‘subjects’ a person to a deprivation of rights or ‘causes’ a person ‘to be subjected’ to such deprivation.”) (quoting *Monell v. Dep’t of Soc. Servs. of City of New York*, 436 U.S. 658, 692 (1978)); *Cash v. Cnty. of Erie*, 654 F.3d 324, 333 (2d Cir. 2011). In other words, to state a § 1983 claim against a municipality, the plaintiff must allege facts showing (1) the existence of a municipal policy, custom, or practice, and (2) that the policy, custom, or practice caused the violation of the plaintiff’s constitutional rights. *See Jones v. Town of East Haven*, 691 F.3d 72, 80 (2d Cir. 2012); *Bd. of Cnty. Comm’rs of Bryan Cnty. v. Brown*, 520 U.S. 397, 403 (1997) (internal citations omitted). There are no allegations in the complaint suggesting that a policy, custom, or practice of New York City caused the violation of Plaintiff’s constitutional rights.

### LEAVE TO REPLEAD

Plaintiff proceeds in this matter without the benefit of an attorney. District courts generally should grant a self-represented plaintiff an opportunity to amend a complaint to cure its defects, unless amendment would be futile. *See Hill v. Curcione*, 657 F.3d 116, 123-24 (2d Cir. 2011); *Salahuddin v. Cuomo*, 861 F.2d 40, 42 (2d Cir. 1988). Indeed, the Second Circuit has cautioned that district courts “should not dismiss [a *pro se* complaint] without granting leave to amend at least once when a liberal reading of the complaint gives any indication that a valid claim might be stated.” *Cuoco v. Moritsugu*, 222 F.3d 99, 112 (2d Cir. 2000) (quoting *Gomez v. USAA Fed. Sav. Bank*, 171 F.3d 794, 795 (2d Cir. 1999)). In light of Plaintiff’s *pro se* status, and in an abundance of caution, the Court grants Plaintiff 30 days’ leave to amend his complaint to provide facts showing that the Court has subject matter jurisdiction of his claims.

### CONCLUSION

Plaintiff’s complaint, filed IFP under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(1), is dismissed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(ii), and for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(h)(3).

The Court grants Plaintiff 30 days’ leave to replead his claims in an amended complaint. Plaintiff must submit the amended complaint to this Court’s Pro Se Intake Unit within 30 days of the date of this order, caption the document as an “Amended Complaint,” and label the document with docket number 23-CV-7386 (LTS). If Plaintiff fails to file an amended complaint within the prescribed time and he cannot show good cause for such failure, the Court will enter judgment dismissing the action, and declining to exercise supplemental jurisdiction of any state law claims Plaintiff may be asserting, 28 U.S.C. § 1367(c)(3).

The Clerk of Court is instructed to hold this matter open on the docket until judgment is entered. An amended complaint form is attached to this order.

The Court certifies under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3) that any appeal from this order would not be taken in good faith, and therefore IFP status is denied for the purpose of an appeal. *Cf. Coppedge v. United States*, 369 U.S. 438, 444-45 (1962) (holding that an appellant demonstrates good faith when he seeks review of a nonfrivolous issue).

SO ORDERED.

Dated: October 10, 2023  
New York, New York

/s/ Laura Taylor Swain

LAURA TAYLOR SWAIN  
Chief United States District Judge

---

---

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

---

Write the full name of each plaintiff.

\_\_\_\_ CV \_\_\_\_  
(Include case number if one has been assigned)

-against-

**AMENDED**

**COMPLAINT**

Do you want a jury trial?

☐ Yes ☐ No

---

Write the full name of each defendant. If you need more space, please write "see attached" in the space above and attach an additional sheet of paper with the full list of names. The names listed above must be identical to those contained in Section II.

**NOTICE**

The public can access electronic court files. For privacy and security reasons, papers filed with the court should therefore *not* contain: an individual's full social security number or full birth date; the full name of a person known to be a minor; or a complete financial account number. A filing may include *only*: the last four digits of a social security number; the year of an individual's birth; a minor's initials; and the last four digits of a financial account number. See Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 5.2.



## I. BASIS FOR JURISDICTION

Federal courts are courts of limited jurisdiction (limited power). Generally, only two types of cases can be heard in federal court: cases involving a federal question and cases involving diversity of citizenship of the parties. Under 28 U.S.C. § 1331, a case arising under the United States Constitution or federal laws or treaties is a federal question case. Under 28 U.S.C. § 1332, a case in which a citizen of one State sues a citizen of another State or nation, and the amount in controversy is more than \$75,000, is a diversity case. In a diversity case, no defendant may be a citizen of the same State as any plaintiff.

What is the basis for federal-court jurisdiction in your case?

- ☐ **Federal Question**
- ☐ **Diversity of Citizenship**

### A. If you checked Federal Question

Which of your federal constitutional or federal statutory rights have been violated?

---

---

---

---

### B. If you checked Diversity of Citizenship

#### 1. Citizenship of the parties

Of what State is each party a citizen?

The plaintiff, \_\_\_\_\_, is a citizen of the State of  
(Plaintiff's name)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(State in which the person resides and intends to remain.)

or, if not lawfully admitted for permanent residence in the United States, a citizen or subject of the foreign state of

\_\_\_\_\_.

If more than one plaintiff is named in the complaint, attach additional pages providing information for each additional plaintiff.

If the defendant is an individual:

The defendant, \_\_\_\_\_, is a citizen of the State of  
(Defendant's name)

\_\_\_\_\_  
or, if not lawfully admitted for permanent residence in the United States, a citizen or  
subject of the foreign state of

\_\_\_\_\_  
If the defendant is a corporation:

The defendant, \_\_\_\_\_, is incorporated under the laws of  
the State of \_\_\_\_\_

and has its principal place of business in the State of \_\_\_\_\_

or is incorporated under the laws of (foreign state) \_\_\_\_\_

and has its principal place of business in \_\_\_\_\_.

If more than one defendant is named in the complaint, attach additional pages providing  
information for each additional defendant.

## II. PARTIES

### A. Plaintiff Information

Provide the following information for each plaintiff named in the complaint. Attach additional  
pages if needed.

First Name	Middle Initial	Last Name
Street Address		
County, City	State	Zip Code
Telephone Number	Email Address (if available)	

**B. Defendant Information**

To the best of your ability, provide addresses where each defendant may be served. If the correct information is not provided, it could delay or prevent service of the complaint on the defendant. Make sure that the defendants listed below are the same as those listed in the caption. Attach additional pages if needed.

Defendant 1:

First Name	Last Name	
Current Job Title (or other identifying information)		
Current Work Address (or other address where defendant may be served)		
County, City	State	Zip Code

Defendant 2:

First Name	Last Name	
Current Job Title (or other identifying information)		
Current Work Address (or other address where defendant may be served)		
County, City	State	Zip Code

Defendant 3:

First Name	Last Name	
Current Job Title (or other identifying information)		
Current Work Address (or other address where defendant may be served)		
County, City	State	Zip Code



---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

**INJURIES:**

If you were injured as a result of these actions, describe your injuries and what medical treatment, if any, you required and received.

---

---

---

---

---

**IV. RELIEF**

State briefly what money damages or other relief you want the court to order.

---

---

---

---

---

**V. PLAINTIFF'S CERTIFICATION AND WARNINGS**

By signing below, I certify to the best of my knowledge, information, and belief that: (1) the complaint is not being presented for an improper purpose (such as to harass, cause unnecessary delay, or needlessly increase the cost of litigation); (2) the claims are supported by existing law or by a nonfrivolous argument to change existing law; (3) the factual contentions have evidentiary support or, if specifically so identified, will likely have evidentiary support after a reasonable opportunity for further investigation or discovery; and (4) the complaint otherwise complies with the requirements of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 11.

I agree to notify the Clerk's Office in writing of any changes to my mailing address. I understand that my failure to keep a current address on file with the Clerk's Office may result in the dismissal of my case.

Each Plaintiff must sign and date the complaint. Attach additional pages if necessary. If seeking to proceed without prepayment of fees, each plaintiff must also submit an IFP application.

_____		_____	
Dated		Plaintiff's Signature	
_____			
First Name	Middle Initial	Last Name	
_____			
Street Address			
_____			
County, City		State	Zip Code
_____			
Telephone Number		Email Address (if available)	
_____			

I have read the Pro Se (Nonprisoner) Consent to Receive Documents Electronically:

☐ Yes   ☐ No

If you do consent to receive documents electronically, submit the completed form with your complaint. If you do not consent, please do not attach the form.